

Reply to Office Action dated February 9, 2007

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-20 and 22-31 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15, 17-19 and 22 are amended, claim 16 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and new claims 23-31 are added. Various amendments are made to the claims for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-2, 6, 8, 10-12, 14-16, 18-20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by U.S. Patent 5,661,641 to Shindo. The Office Action also rejects claims 3-5, 9, 13 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Shindo in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0171133 to Mizuta. The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites a main unit that includes separated first and second key sections and a display unit configured to slide relative to the surface of the main unit to cause the first and second key sections of the main unit to be selectively exposed. Independent claim 1 also recites that the display unit can be selectively slid to a first position where both the first and second key sections of the main unit are exposed, a second position where only one of the first and second key sections is exposed, and a third position where both the first and second key sections are not exposed. Independent claim 1 also recites a third separate input section being function buttons on an upper surface of the display unit and a stopper mechanism to stop and maintain the display unit at exactly the second position.

The applied do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 1. More specifically, the Office Action cites Shindo's FIGs. 6-8 for the claimed first, second and third positions. The Office Action also cites Shindo's FIG. 7 and col. 6, line 14-col. 7, line 52 as

Reply to Office Action dated February 9, 2007

teaching a stopper mechanism to allow the display unit to be stopped at the second position (as recited in previous claim 2).

Applicants respectfully submit that FIG. 7 and col. 6, line 14-col. 7, line 52 do not teach or suggest the claimed stopper mechanism to stop and maintain the display unit at exactly a second position. Rather, Shindo merely discloses that slide pins 41U and 41L of the card casing are slid along upper and lower guide grooves 36U and 36L of upper and lower step portions 35U and 35L of the body casing 2. Shindo does not teach or suggest a stopper mechanism that relates to a second position (where only one of the first and second key sections is exposed). Furthermore, Shindo has no discussion for a stopper mechanism to stop or maintain a display unit in exactly a second position.

The Office Action (on page 6) also appears to cite Mizuta's paragraphs [0014]-[0023] as teaching features relating to a housing stopped at a desired one of a plurality of stop positions with respect to a main housing. Mizuta does not teach or suggest the claimed stopper mechanism to stop or maintain a display unit at exactly a second position (relative to a main unit). Accordingly, Mizuta may not be combined with Shindo so as to find all the features of independent claim 1.

For at least the reasons set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 1. Thus, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 8 recites a main unit that includes first and second key sections and a display unit that includes a display screen. Independent claim 8 further recites that the display

Reply to Office Action dated February 9, 2007

unit is configured to selectively move relative to the surface of the main unit between a first position where both the first and second key sections of the main unit are not accessible, a second position where only one of the first and second key sections is accessible, and a third position where both the first and second key sections are accessible. Independent claim 8 also recites that the first key section is operated to perform a first function of inputting numbers and the second key section is operated to perform a second function of different multimedia functions.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 8. More specifically, the Office Action appears to rely on Shindo's Element 25, CLR, STO and F keys (of FIG. 7) as corresponding to the claimed first key (section) and MODE and Error keys (of FIG. 6) as corresponding to the claimed second key section. However, these features do not relate to the claimed first key section is operated to perform a first function of inputting numbers and second key section is operated to perform a second function of different multimedia functions, as recited in independent claim 8. Shindo's Element 25, CLR and STO do not perform a first function of inputting numbers. Additionally, Shindo's MODE and Error keys do not perform a second function of different multimedia functions. Accordingly, Shindo does not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 8. Furthermore, there is no suggestion to modify Shindo as Shindo clearly discloses a keypad 49 on a rear side panel of card casing 3. See col. 5, lines 33-37.

Reply to Office Action dated February 9, 2007

For at least these reasons, Shindo does not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 8. Mizuta does not teach or suggest the features of independent claim 8 missing from Shindo. Thus, independent claim 8 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 10 recites a main unit including separated first and second key sections, a display unit and first and second magnets. Independent claim 10 also recites a stopper mechanism to temporarily stop the display unit at a position where only one of the first and second key sections is exposed.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 10. More specifically, Shindo and Mizuta do not teach or suggest the claimed stopper mechanism configured to temporarily stop the display unit at a position where only one of the first and second key sections is exposed. Accordingly, independent claim 10 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 19 recites sliding a display unit of a portable terminal to a first position and sliding the display unit to a second position where only one of the first and second key sections is exposed. Independent claim 19 also recites providing a resistive locking member between the display unit and the main unit, wherein the resistive locking member has an engaging member and an engagement member that retractably engage at least when the display unit is in the second position.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 19. When discussing independent claim 19, the Office Action (on page 3) does not discuss the claimed resistive locking member. Shindo and

Reply to Office Action dated February 9, 2007

Mizuta do not teach or suggest providing a resistive locking member between the display unit and the main unit, wherein the resistive locking member has an engaging member and an engagement member that retractably engage at least when the display unit is in the second position. Accordingly, independent claim 19 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 22 recites a stopping mechanism coupled to the first and second units and configured to stop the first and second units in a first position where both the first and second plurality of keys of the first unit are exposed, to stop one of the first unit or the second unit in a second position where the third plurality of keys and only one of the first and second plurality of keys are exposed, and to allow the first unit and the second unit to be in a third position relative to each other where both the first and second plurality of keys are not exposed.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 22. When discussing independent claim 22, the Office Action never discusses the claimed stopping mechanism. Shindo and Mizuta do not suggest the claimed stopping mechanism. Thus, independent claim 22 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 1, 8, 10, 19 and 22 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

Reply to Office Action dated February 9, 2007

For example, dependent claim 6 recites the first key section is a number key section and the second key section is a function key section that includes a microphone. See also dependent claims 18, 23 and 27. The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features. That is, Shindo clearly shows keypad 49 on a rear side panel 38 of the card casing and a transmitter 13 housing apertures 14 at a lower portion 50L. Thus, dependent claims 6, 18, 23 and 27 define patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

Additionally, dependent claim 24 recites that the first key section includes keys to input numbers. Also, dependent claim 25 recites that the second key section includes keys to perform different multimedia functions. See also dependent claim 23. The applied references do not teach or suggest these features. Thus, dependent claims 23-25 define patentable subject matter as least for this additional reason.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-6, 8-15, 17-20 and 22-31 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. **10/784,703**

Docket No. **IK-0076**

Reply to Office Action dated February 9, 2007

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren  
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

**Date: May 4, 2007**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**

\\Fk4\Documents\2047\2047-073\118803.doc